### IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

STEVEN MARRAZZO	:
731 Parker Street	:
Langhorne, PA 19047	: CIVIL ACTION
Plaintiff,	: : No.:
V.	:
	: JURY TRIAL DEMANDED
MARQUIS AUTO RESTORATIONS, LLC	C:
10085 Sandmeyer Lane	:
Philadelphia, PA 19116	:
and	:
JIM KLOTZ	:
c/o Marquis Auto Restorations, LLC	:
10085 Sandmeyer Lane	:
Philadelphia, PA 19116	:
and	:
ALAN LEWENTHAL	:
c/o Marquis Auto Restorations, LLC	:
10085 Sandmeyer Lane	:
Philadelphia, PA 19116	:
Defendants.	:
	_ :

#### **CIVIL ACTION COMPLAINT**

Plaintiff, Steven Marrazzo (hereinafter referred to as "Plaintiff"), by and through his undersigned counsel, hereby avers as follows:

#### I. Introduction

1. Plaintiff has initiated this action to redress violations by Defendants of the Fair Labor Standards Act ("FLSA - 29 U.S.C. § 201 *et. seq.*) and applicable state law(s). As a direct consequence of Defendants' unlawful actions, Plaintiff seeks damages as set forth herein.

#### II. Jurisdiction and Venue

- 2. This Court has original subject matter jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331 because the claims arise under the laws of the United States. This Court has supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiff's state law claims because they arise out of the same circumstances and are based upon a common nucleus of operative fact.
- 3. This Court may properly maintain personal jurisdiction over Defendants because of their contacts with this state and this judicial district are sufficient for the exercise of jurisdiction in order to comply with traditional notions of fair play and substantial justice, satisfying the standard set forth by the United States Supreme Court in International Shoe Co. v. Washington, 326 U.S. 310 (1945) and its progeny.
- 4. Venue is properly laid in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391(b)(1) and (b)(2), because Defendant resides in and/or conducts business in this judicial district and because a substantial part of the acts and/or omissions giving rise to the claims set forth herein occurred in this judicial district.

#### III. Parties

- 5. The foregoing paragraphs are incorporated herein in their entirety as if set forth in full.
  - 6. Plaintiff is an adult individual with an address as set forth above.
- 7. Defendant Marquis Auto Restorations, LLC (hereinafter "Defendant Entity") is a private company that owns and operates an automobile body and paint shop in Philadelphia, PA.
- 8. Defendant Jim Klotz (hereinafter "Defendant Klotz") is upon information and belief a high-level manager of Defendant Entity who oversees daily operations, manages

operations, and who exercises authority and control over the terms and conditions of employees including but not limited to terms of compensation, wages and pay of employees.

- 9. Defendant Alan Lewenthal (hereinafter "Defendant Lewental") is upon information and belief the owner of Defendant Entity who retains absolute authority over business decisions, operations, and who exercises authority and control over the terms and conditions of employees including but not limited to terms of compensation, wages and pay of employees.<sup>1</sup>
- 10. At all times relevant herein, Defendants<sup>2</sup> acted by and through their agents, servants, and employees, each of whom acted at all times relevant herein in the course and scope of their employment with and for the benefit of Defendants.

#### IV. Factual Background

- 11. The foregoing paragraphs are incorporated herein as if set forth in full.
- 12. Plaintiff was hired to work for Defendants on or about June 8, 2015 as an auto body prepper / paint technician.
- 13. While employed with Defendants, Plaintiff did not supervise employees, have the ability to hire or terminate employees, and did not evaluate employees or perform typical supervisory functions.
- 14. Additionally, while employed with Defendants, Plaintiff did not make decisions for Defendants concerning matters related to operating the business, such as entering into binding contracts, advertising matters, or other fiscal matters.

3

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Defendant Klotz and Defendant Lewenthal are hereinafter collectively referred to as "Defendant Individuals" unless indicated otherwise.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Defendant Entity, Defendant Klotz, and Defendant Lewenthal are hereinafter collectively referred to as "Defendants" unless indicated otherwise.

- 15. Plaintiff was not required to have an advanced degree and performed primarily manual labor during his employment with Defendants.
- 16. Plaintiff merely performed routine painting/prepping duties for Defendants on a daily basis and did not exercise any meaningful discretion in the performance of his job.
- 17. Plaintiff was also compensated for his work with Defendants at a rate of \$15 per hour.
- 18. Plaintiff often worked 2-10 hours of overtime (in excess of forty hours per week) per week when employed with Defendants.
- 19. Despite working in excess of forty hours per week, Plaintiff was never compensated at an overtime rate (one and one half times his hourly rate).
- 20. Plaintiff asked Defendant Klotz and Defendant Lewenthol on multiple occasions why he was not being paid overtime and was told simply that Defendant Entity could not afford overtime.
- 21. Defendant Klotz even told Plaintiff, "you can come in and work OT, but we can't afford to pay you for it."
- 22. Defendants' management would also deduct lunch periods from Plaintiff's pay although Plaintiff rarely took lunch breaks and would usually work through such scheduled lunch breaks.
- 23. While employed with Defendants, Plaintiff was at all times relevant herein unequivocally a non-exempt employee who should have been paid overtime for all hours worked over 40 hours per week at a rate of time and one half but never received such payments.
- 24. Plaintiff also improperly had lunch periods deducted from his pay even though he actually performed work instead of taking such breaks.

# Count I <u>Violations of the Fair Labor Standards Act ("FLSA")</u> (Failure to Pay Overtime Wages) -Against All Defendants-

- 25. The foregoing paragraphs are incorporated herein as if set forth in full.
- 26. Upon information and belief, Defendant Entity generates in excess of \$500,000 per year in gross revenue.
- 27. At all times relevant herein, Defendants are, and continue to be, "employers" within the meaning of the FLSA.
- 28. At all times relevant herein, Plaintiff was an "employee" within the meaning of the FLSA.
- 29. The FLSA requires covered employers, such as Defendants, to minimally compensate its "non-exempt" employees, such as Plaintiff, at a rate of 1.5 times the employee's regular rate of pay for each overtime hour that the employee works (*i.e.* hours in excess of 40 hours in a workweek).
- 30. At all times during his employment with Defendants, Plaintiff was a "non-exempt" employee within the meaning of the FLSA.
- 31. Defendants knew that Plaintiff was a "non-exempt" employee within the meaning of the FLSA.
- 32. Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff 1.5 times Plaintiff's regular rate of pay for each hour that he worked over 40 each workweek.
- 33. As a result of Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff the overtime compensation due him, Defendants violated the FLSA and caused Plaintiff to suffer damages in the form of unpaid overtime compensation.

34. Defendant Individuals are personally liable because they are owners/managers of Defendant Entity and are responsible for the terms and conditions of employment for Plaintiff including but not limited to his compensation. Defendant Individuals are also responsible for perpetuating unlawful payroll practices and ratifying same.

#### Count II

### Violations of the Pennsylvania Minimum Wage Act ("PMWA") (Failure to Pay Overtime Wages) -Against All Defendants-

- 35. The foregoing paragraphs are incorporated herein in their entirety as if set forth in full.
- 36. At all times relevant herein, Defendants are, and continue to be, "employers" within the meaning of the PMWA.
- 37. At all times relevant herein, Plaintiff was employed by Defendants as an "employee" within the meaning of the PMWA.
- 38. The PMWA requires covered employers, such as Defendants, to minimally compensate its "non-exempt" employees, such as Plaintiff, 1.5 times the employee's regular rate of pay for each hour that the employee works over 40 in a workweek.
- 39. At all times during his employment with Defendants, Plaintiff was a "non-exempt" employee within the meaning of the PMWA.
- 40. Defendants knew that Plaintiff was a "non-exempt" employee within the meaning of the PMWA.
- 41. Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff time and one half for all hours that he worked over 40 each workweek.
- 42. Defendants' failure to pay Plaintiff's wages and overtime compensation as aforesaid constitute violations of the PMWA.

43. Defendant Individuals are personally liable because they are owners/managers of Defendant Entity and are responsible for the terms and conditions of employment for Plaintiff including but not limited to his compensation. Defendant Individuals are also responsible for perpetuating unlawful payroll practices and ratifying same.

# Count III <u>Violation of the Pennsylvania Wage Payment Collection Law ("WPCL")</u> (43 P.S. 260.3(a)-(b)) -Against All Defendants-

- 44. The foregoing paragraphs are incorporated herein in their entirety as if set forth in full.
- 45. Plaintiff had an agreement with Defendants whereby Defendants agreed to compensate Plaintiff for services he performed during his employment.
- 46. Defendants failed to compensate Plaintiff for all wages owed during his employment.
- 47. Plaintiff performed the agreed-upon services for Defendants, and Defendants failed to properly compensate Plaintiff for the services rendered as specified by the Parties' employment agreement (included but not limited to paying Plaintiff for all hours worked before his scheduled start time, after hours, and on weekends).
- 48. These actions as aforesaid constitute violations of the Pennsylvania Wage Payment and Collection Law.
- 49. Defendant Individuals are personally liable because they are owners/managers of Defendant Entity and are responsible for the terms and conditions of employment for Plaintiff including but not limited to his compensation. Defendant Individuals are also responsible for perpetuating unlawful payroll practices and ratifying same.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays that this Court enter an Order providing that:

- A. Defendants are to be prohibited from continuing to maintain their illegal policy, practice or custom of unlawfully paying employees and are to be ordered to promulgate an effective policy against such unlawful acts and to adhere thereto;
- B. Defendants are to compensate Plaintiff, reimburse Plaintiff and make Plaintiff whole for any and all pay and benefits Plaintiff would have received had it not been for Defendants' illegal actions, including but not limited to past lost earnings and any other owed compensation.
- C. Plaintiff is to be awarded liquidated damages, as permitted by applicable law, in an amount determined by the Court or trier of fact to be appropriate to punish Defendants for their willful, deliberate, malicious and outrageous conduct and to deter Defendants or other employers from engaging in such misconduct in the future;
- D. Plaintiff is to be awarded the costs and expenses of this action and reasonable legal fees as provided by applicable federal and state law;
- E. Any verdict in favor of Plaintiff is to be molded by the Court to maximize the financial recovery available to the Plaintiff in light of the caps on certain damages set forth in applicable federal law; and
- F. Plaintiff's claims are to receive trial by jury to the extent allowed by applicable law. Plaintiff has also endorsed this demand on the caption of this Complaint in accordance with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 38(b).

Respectfully submitted,

KARPF, KARPF & CERUTTI, P.C.

Ari R. Karpf, Esq. 3331 Street Road Two Greenwood Square Suite 128 Bensalem, PA 19020

(215) 639-0801

Dated: May 18, 2016

#### IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

#### CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM

Telephone	FAX Nu	mber	E-Mail Address		
(215) 639-0801	(215) 639-	4970	akarpf@karpf-law.com		
Date	Attorney	-at-law	Attorney for		
5/23/2016	4		Plaintiff		
(f) Standard Management	- Cases that do	not fall into	any one of the other tracks.	(X)	
commonly referred to a the court. (See reverse management cases.)	s complex and t side of this form	that need sp n for a deta	racks (a) through (d) that are ecial or intense management by iled explanation of special	( )	
(d) Asbestos – Cases involence exposure to asbestos.	ving claims for	personal inj	ury or property damage from	( )	
(c) Arbitration - Cases requ	uired to be desig	gnated for a	rbitration under Local Civil Rule 53.2.		
(b) Social Security - Cases and Human Services de	requesting revi nying plaintiff	ew of a dec Social Secu	ision of the Secretary of Health rity Benefits.	· ( )	
(a) Habeas Corpus - Cases brought under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 through § 2255.					
SELECT ONE OF THE F	OLLOWING	CASE MAI	NAGEMENT TRACKS:		
plaintiff shall complete a C filing the complaint and ser side of this form.) In the designation, that defendant	ase Managemer we a copy on all of event that a de shall, with its farties, a Case M	nt Track Der defendants. fendant doe irst appeara anagement	ay Reduction Plan of this court, cour signation Form in all civil cases at the (See § 1:03 of the plan set forth on the is not agree with the plaintiff regardince, submit to the clerk of court and so Track Designation Form specifying the signed.	time of reverse ng said erve on	
Marquis Auto Restoration	ons, LLC, et al.	:	NO.		
v.		:			
Steven Marra	azzo	•	CIVIL ACTION		

(Civ. 660) 10/02



#### UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA — DESIGNATION FORM to assignment to appropriate calendar.	be used by counsel to indicate the category of the case for the	purpose of
Address of Plaintiff: 731 Parker Street, Langhorne, PA 19047		
Address of Defendant: 10085 Sandmeyer Lane, Philadelphia, PA 19	9116	****
Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction: Defendants place of business		-
(Use Reverse Side For	Additional Space)	
Does this civil action involve a nongovernmental corporate party with any parent corporation		
(Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a	)) Yes $\square$ No $\square$	? .
Does this case involve multidistrict litigation possibilities?	Yes NoX	
RELATED CASE, IF ANY: Case Number: Judge		
	Date Terminated:	
Civil cases are deemed related when yes is answered to any of the following questions:	•	
1. Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one y	ear previously terminated action in this court?	
	V <sub>an</sub> FI suFI	•
<ol><li>Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior action in this court?</li></ol>	suit pending or within one year previously terminated	
	Yes□ No□	
3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier	numbered case pending or within one year previously	
terminated action in this court?	Yea□ No□	
4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil right	is case filed by the same individual?	
•	Yes□ No□	
CIVIL: (Place ✓ in ONE CATEGORY ONLY)		
A. Federal Question Cases:	<b>D</b>	,
1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts	B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases:	
2. □ FELA	1.   Insurance Contract and Other Contracts	
3. D Jones Act-Personal Injury	2. D Airplane Personal Injury	
4. Antitrust	3. Assault, Defamation	*
5. Patent	4. D Marine Personal Injury	
6. A Labor-Management Relations	5. D Motor Vehicle Personal Injury	•
7. □ Civil Rights	6. O Other Personal Injury (Please specify)	
•	7. Products Liability	
8. ☐ Habeas Corpus	8.  Products Liability — Asbestos	
9.  Securities Act(s) Cases	9. □ All other Diversity Cases	
10. □ Social Security Review Cases	(Please specify)	
11. D All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify)		-
ARBITRATION CERTII (Check Appropriate Cat 1, Ari R. Karpf counsel of record do bereby cartifu	egary)	
All R. Kaipi  Description of record do hereby certify:  Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2), that to the best of my knowledge and be \$150,000,00 exclusive of interest and costs:	Staff she demand and the staff she was a staff	
	men, me damages recoverable in this civil action case exceed the sun	of
Relief other than monetary damages is sought.		
DATE: 5/23/2016	ARK2484	
Attorney-at-Law	Attorney I D# 04 500	
NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if there	has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38.	
certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is not refuted to any case now pending or with the case is noted above.	thin one year previously terminated action in this court	
5/22/2010		
/AICI	ARK2484	
Attomey-at-Law CIV. 609 (5/2012)	Attorney 1.D.# 91538	

">JS 44 (Rev. 12/07, NJ 5/08)

#### CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

THE CHILD COLLEGE								
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS		•		DEFENDANTS				
MARRAZZO, STEV	EN			MARQUIS A	JTO RESTORA	NOITA	S, LLC, ET AL	•
(b) County of Residence	of First Listed Plaintiff	Bucks		County of Residence	of First Listed Defende	ant <u>F</u>	Philadelphia	,
(c) Attorney's (Firm Na	me, Address, Telephone Ni	ımber and Email Add	ress)	NOTE: IN LAN	D CONDEMNATION C.	ASES. USE	THE LOCATION O	t rue
Karpf, Karpf & Ce Two Greenwood PA 19020, (215)	Square, Suite 128	3, Bensalem,	m		NVOLVED.	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	THE ESCATION O	r ime
II. BASIS OF JURISI	ICTION (Place an "X" i	n One Box Only)		TIZENSHIP OF P	RINCIPAL PAR	RTIES(P	ace an "X" in One Bo	x for Plaintiff
□ 1 U.S. Government Plainliff	X 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government)	Not a Party)				ated <i>or</i> Princes ated or This S		
© 2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenshi	p of Parties in Item III)				sin <del>es</del> s In An	other State	
				en or Subject of a  reign Country	3 C 3 Foreign l	Nation		6 🗇 6
IV. NATURE OF SUI	T (Place on "X" in One Box Or	ıly)				TE SINCE	PER SANAC III	
MARKET CONTRACTOR								
& Enforcement of Judgment    151 Medicare Act     152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excl. Veterans)     153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits     160 Stockholders' Suits     190 Other Contract     195 Contract Product Liability     196 Franchise     210 Land Condemnation     220 Foreclosure     220 Foreclosure	330 Federal Employers' Liability     340 Marine     345 Marine Product Liability     350 Motor Vehicle     355 Motor Vehicle     70 Product Liability     360 Other Personal Injury     441 Voting     442 Employment     443 Housing/ Accommodations     444 Wolfere	PERSONAL INJUR  362 Personal Injury - Med, Malpractic  365 Personal Injury - Product Liability  368 Asbestos Personal Injury - Product Liability  PERSONAL PROPER  370 Other Fraud  371 Truth in Lending  380 Other Personal Property Damage  385 Property Damage Product Liability  PERSONER PETTIO  510 Motions to Vacat Santence  Habeas Corpus:  530 General  535 Death Penalty  540 Mandaunus & Otl  550 Civil Rights  555 Prison Condition		O Agriculture O Other Food & Drug 5 Drug Related Scizure of Property 21 USC 881 O Liquor Lews O R.R. & Truck O Airline Regs. O Occupational Safety/Health O Other  O Fair Labor Standards Act O Labor/Mgmt. Relations O Labor/Mgmt. Relations O Labor/Mgmt. Reporting. & Disclosure Act O Railway Labor Act O Rilway Labor Act O Rilway Labor Act O Relations O Empl. Ret. Inc. Security Act	□ 861 HIA (1395ff) □ 862 Black Lung (92: □ 863 DIWC/DIWW □ 864 SSID Title XVI □ 865 RSI (405(g)) □ 870 Taxes (U.S. Plai or Defendant) □ 871 IRS—Third Par 26 USC 7609	11 SAMA 2	400 State Reappor 410 Antitrust 430 Banks and Ba 450 Commerce 460 Deportation 470 Racketeer Infl Corrupt Organ 480 Consumer Cre 490 Cable/Sat TV 810 Selective Serv 850 Securities/Cor Exchange 875 Customer Cha 12 USC 3410 890 Other Statutor 891 Agricultural A 892 Economic Stat 893 Environments 894 Energy Alloca 895 Freedom of In Act 900 Appeal of Fee I Under Equal A to Justice 950 Constitutionali State Statutes	nking  menced and izations dit ice minodities/ llenge y Actions cts pilization Act I Matters tion Act formation Determination ccess
☑ 1 Original ☐ 2 Re	ate Court	Appellate Court	Reop	nened speci	fy)	fultidistric itigation	1.1	rate
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION	ON Brief description of ca	use:		Do not cite jurisdiction				
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:		e FLSA and app is a class action 23		STATE TAW(S).	CHECK Y JURY DE		demanded in compl	
VIII. RELATED CAS	E(S) (See instructions):	JUDGE			DOCKET NUMB	ER		
Explanation:				the same and was a second				
5/23/2016			<u></u>					
DATE		SIGNATURE O	F ATTOI	NEY OF RECORD			<u> </u>	-

Export as PDF

Save As...

Retrieve PDF File

Reset